

**UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Offic**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/494,374 01/31/00 COMPADRE

C 23533/119

EXAMINER
----------

FOLEY & LARDNER  
3000 K STREET N W SUITE 500  
Washington DC 20007-5109

HM12/0129

MCQUEENEY, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED:

01/29/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/494,374	COMPADRE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	P. E. McQueeney	1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 40-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) *S~ B~ S~ 1~ r~ r~*

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.

18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Acknowledgement is made of applicant's transmittal of missing parts of patent application filed May 15, 2000 and information disclosure statement filed May 19, 2000.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-13, 25-27, 31 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hall (US 5,405,604). Hall discloses a concentrated mouthrinse. Hall discloses applicant's claims 1-8, 10-13, 31 and 34-38 in claim 1 (about 0.05% to about 10.0% cationic antimicrobial agent; about 30 to about 85% of propylene glycol, polyethylene glycol, and mixtures thereof; water). Hall discloses applicant's claim 25-27 in claim 2 (cetylpyridinium chloride and tetradecylpyridinium chloride and mixtures thereof).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall, as discussed above, in view of Dickson (US 5,520,575).

Hall discloses a maximum concentration of cationic antimicrobial agent of about 10%. Hall does not disclose a concentration of cationic antimicrobial agent of about 15% (applicant's claim 9); about 20% (applicant's claim 21); and about 40% (applicant's claims 14-16, 20, 24 and 32). Dickson teaches at col. 4, lines 12-35 that the concentration of antimicrobial agents typically range from about 1 to about 30%. It is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the concentration of the antimicrobial agent and delivery mechanism based on its intended purpose. The expected result would be a successful product.

Hall does not disclose spraying or misting his product. It is the position of the examiner that all liquid products are sprayable or mistable. As Hall's product is a liquid, this meets the limitations of applicant's claim 39.

***Election/Restrictions***

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-39, drawn to a composition, classified in class 514, subclass 579.
- II. Claims 40-43, drawn to a method of treating food, classified in class 426, subclass 332.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the composition can be used in a materially different process such as in a method for impregnating or treating tissue paper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Jayme A. Juleatt on November 30, 2000 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-39. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 40-43 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to P. E. McQueeney whose telephone number is 703-306-5827. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, H, F 7:45 AM to 6:15 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on 703-308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-3592 for regular communications and 703-308-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1234.

pem  
January 26, 2001

THURMAN K. PAGE  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNICAL CENTER 1600  
*T. K. Page*